



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Italian conceits and quibbles which had been increasing in the literature since the time when Italy began first to influence England. Euphuism was rather the end than the beginning. This same affectation existed in France as well as in England, and was one of the peculiarities of the coterie of the Hôtel de Rambouillet until Molière's sarcasm, sixty years later, put a stop to it.

We must also object to the modernization of the spelling of some of the earlier authors in the extracts which are given. However this may do in smaller, more popular works, it is a blemish and an unpardonable sin against language in a work aiming at literary excellence. We cannot really appreciate an ancient style in a modern dress, any more than we could the poetry of Chaucer if we tried to put in a different kind of metre, as Mr. Craik suggests.

Had the style of Mr. Craik himself been better, it would have improved the book. He indulges a little too much in bombast, and sometimes in ungrammatical expressions. But these faults are rare, and not perhaps worth dwelling upon.

3. — *A Dictionary of the Bible, comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. In Three Volumes. Vol. II. Kalzeel — Red Heifer. Vol. III. Red Sea — Zuzims. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1863. 8vo. pp. 1862. Appendix, pp. cxvi.

THE first volume of Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" was issued in 1860, and was at that time noticed in our pages. The second and larger portion of the work, in two volumes, has recently appeared, with an Appendix containing titles omitted in the first volume. We regret that want of space will not permit us to give such a review of the completed work as its importance demands. We can only state concisely what seem to us to be its merits and its defects.

Its literary excellence is, on the whole, very high. In nearly all the articles the style is clear, pure, free from rhetorical artifice, and adapted to a work of this kind.

The form in which the articles are cast and the method of discussion are generally good. The English title of each subject from the Scripture has its Greek and Hebrew equivalent; quotations are made to a great extent in the original languages; for the more important opinions abundant authorities are cited, with exact references; and the history of each subject is given as far as possible.

The Dictionary is very full, not only in its treatment of the impor-

tant topics, but in the number of its titles. No Biblical Dictionary in English is comparable to it in this respect. Most of the topics on which a student of the Scripture would wish for information receives some attention, and many of the subjects are fully and thoroughly discussed. Especially is this the case in the branches of *geography* and *natural history*. In these the scholarship is minute and comprehensive to an extraordinary degree. All that travellers have noticed, that men of science have discovered, whether in ancient or modern time, is freely used, and a great deal of curious and recondite learning is brought out. These articles have been committed to very competent hands. Next to these articles for fulness and in excellence are the *biographical* articles, which are by no means, as in some dictionaries, mere repetitions and amplifications of the Scripture narratives.

These are the merits of Smith's Biblical Dictionary, — that it is well written, well arranged, and, in certain departments, very full in its information and learning. Against these we have to mention several important defects. In the department of *Biblical criticism*, the Dictionary is by no means up to the mark of Continental scholarship. Its references here are not always to the latest discussions or to the standard works. Many of the ablest German writers are not noticed at all, even in cases where their conclusions and knowledge would be of the highest value. Second-rate works are not unfrequently cited upon matters on which first-rate authorities have uttered their judgment. The article "Pentateuch" is a fair specimen of the defective scholarship in this department of the Dictionary; and the list of authorities at the close of the very inadequate article on the *Psalms* is ludicrous in its meagreness. Still more superficial is the article on the *Books of Samuel*, in singular contrast with the striking story of *the man Samuel*, by Dr. Stanley. In fact, very few of the critical articles in the Dictionary, on the age, origin, and authorship of the Biblical books, are satisfactory.

Next to this, a grave fault of the Dictionary, in our judgment, is its dogmatic and sectarian, and sometimes even its controversial tone. We do not want, in a Biblical Dictionary, any arguments for a creed, even if it be the creed of the majority of the Christian Church. Whatever opinions on theological subjects the writers may hold, they ought not to be intruded in the statement of matters of fact. Very often in these volumes such opinions are introduced, and made even to color the statements of fact. What can we think, for instance, of an argument for the *personality* of the Holy Spirit, which cites, not only proof-texts apart from their connection, but also the subjective emotions and "ex-

periences" of converts, and the superiority of Christian over Pagan civilization? Why should the word "Saviour" be made, in a book of this kind, the vehicle for a defence of the Orthodox doctrine of Atonement? Why should an article on Nicodemus be made to give an indirect hint of the Trinity? This defect is the more to be reprehended, since the Dictionary does not assume a definite theological position, and there are even some opinions advanced in it, as in the article on Miracles, which come near to Rationalism; yet in many of the articles there is an offensive and needless tone of dogmatism, not at all in harmony with the idea of such a work.

A third fault of this Dictionary is the admission of over-much extra-Biblical matter and discussion. We do not ask that the titles of such a work should be kept rigidly to names or things mentioned in the Scripture. It is well that there should be articles on the Apocrypha, the Vulgate, and the Versions. So far as extraneous topics have a direct bearing upon facts in the Biblical history, or help in its illustration, it is fit to introduce them. But why should heathen or ecclesiastical mythology be allowed a place in a Dictionary of the Bible? Is Mary the mother of Jesus, about whom so little is said in the Gospel narrative, and whose whole reputation and influence are post-Biblical, a suitable subject for twenty columns of such a work, while James and John together, even with all the legends attached to their history, have only fourteen columns? This treatise on the legendary Virgin is undoubtedly the most conspicuous sin in this kind; but in numerous instances legendary matter is allowed so to burden and cover the trustworthy information, that it becomes difficult to distinguish between fact and falsehood. There is a great deal of cumbrous and fantastic learning in these volumes, which is likely only to bewilder the unlearned reader.

We have to complain, also, that in some instances very baseless and extravagant theories are allowed too much room in the discussion of critical or topographical questions. The most remarkable of these is Mr. Ferguson's attempt, in the article on Jerusalem, to transfer the site of the Holy Sepulchre to the area of the Temple enclosure, and identify it with the mosque of Omar. His argument is not only a strange specimen of special pleading, but no hint is given that its conclusion is contrary to those of all the other writers who have treated the topic.

Other faults of this Dictionary are the disproportionate space given to unimportant articles; the notes at the foot of the page, which distract the attention of the reader; the absence of any index; and the omission of many subjects on which information would be desired. The

omissions of the first volume, indeed, which were quite remarkable, are in a measure supplied in the Appendix. The supplementary articles upon Antichrist, Baptism, the Church, and Excommunication deserve notice for their fulness. Three of these and the supplement of the fourth are from the hand of Rev. Frederic Meyrick, and exhibit in a striking manner the tone of dogmatism to which we have already alluded.

It will be seen that we do not regard Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" as answering to what such a Dictionary ought to be, or to what, in the present state of Biblical learning, it might be. It has not the breadth of scholarship, the freedom of thought, and the catholic temper which a work of this sort ought to have. Of the seventy-three different contributors to it, some are eminent as scholars and men of science, but more are distinguished simply by official station; and the list is quite as remarkable for the names which it does *not* contain as for those which it includes. Six of the contributors are Americans. In such a compilation as this, if the work is to be done speedily, it must of course be done by many hands; but it gains nothing in value by gathering in the labors of so many mere deans and archdeacons. It is the best work of the kind in the English tongue, but it cannot for a moment be compared with the great work of Winer.

4. — *Hours with the Evangelists.* By I. NICHOLS, D. D. In Two Volumes. Vol. II. Boston: Crosby and Nichols. 1864. 8vo. pp. 388.

ON the appearance of the first volume of this work, we entered into a careful examination of its merits, and expressed our respect for the wisdom and excellence of its author. The volume now before us is a worthy sequel of the first. Dr. Nichols intended to make these volumes a Life of Christ, compiled from the four Evangelists, preceded by appropriate preliminary discussions, and accompanied by such comments as might seem desirable, whether to explain the record, to harmonize seeming discrepancies, to meet objections and cavils, or to deepen the moral and spiritual impression of the Saviour's words and deeds. In the second volume this design is pursued from an early period in the public ministry of Jesus to the morning of his ascension. The style is peculiar, and, to all who knew the writer, bears the stamp of his massive intellect, his deeply meditative habit, and his thoughtful piety. It has a stately, solemn movement, yet the simplicity of one who could not speak or write in other than transparent words, and, withal, the sweetness of a singularly childlike and loving trust in the Divine verities